

BIHEP-TH-2002-31

Associated production of a Higgs boson with tau sleptons in the CP violating MSSM at future e^+e^- colliders

Wei Min Yang* and Dong Sheng Du

*CCAST(World Laboratory), P.O.Box 8730, Beijing 100080, China and
Institute of High Energy Physics, P.O.Box 918(4), Beijing 100039, China*

ABSTRACT

We investigate the production of the lightest neutral Higgs boson in association with tau sleptons in the CP violating minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) at future high-energy e^+e^- linear colliders. In parameter space of the constrained MSSM, the production cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0 \tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-$ can be very substantial at high energies. This process would provide a new production mechanism of neutral Higgs bosons and open a window to probe the Higgs-stau coupling and some soft supersymmetric breaking parameters at next linear colliders (NLC).

PACS numbers: 12.60.Jv, 14.80.Cp, 14.80.Ly

*Email address: yangwm@mail.ihep.ac.cn

I. INTRODUCTION

Supersymmetric (SUSY) theories, in particular the MSSM [1, 2], are currently considered as the most theoretically well motivated extensions of the standard model (SM). It provides a natural solution to the hierarchy problem [3], the generation of the electroweak symmetry breaking [4], the grand unification of the gauge coupling constants [5], as well as the elucidation of the baryon asymmetry and the cold dark matter in the universe [6, 7]. The MSSM contains five physical Higgs bosons [8]: two neutral CP -even scalars (h^0 and H^0), one CP -odd neutral scalar A^0 , and a pair of charged scalars (H^+ , H^-). Such particles break the electroweak symmetry and are responsible for the masses of the fermions and bosons. The search for the Higgs bosons and the study of their properties are one of the major goals of present and future colliders [9]. Contrary to hadron machines, at e^+e^- colliders the background is relatively clean. A future high-energy and high-luminosity e^+e^- linear collider operating at energies $\sqrt{s} = 500 \sim 1000$ GeV would provide an ideal environment for searching the lightest Higgs boson and performing precision measurements of it [10].

In the context of the MSSM, some typical production mechanisms of Higgs bosons, such as Higgsstrahlung [11], vector bosons fusion [12], Higgs pair production [13], and associated production of Higgs boson with top or stop [14], have all been extensively studied at NLC energies. In addition, it was realized that couplings of Higgs bosons to sfermions can also provide additional sources for Higgs bosons production [15], in particular, when the mixing between the third generation scalar taus is very large, the associated production Higgs bosons with tau sleptons might provide a important information on the soft SUSY breaking scalar potential. In this paper, we will discuss in more detail the last type of the prospecting processes in the CP violating MSSM. Our motivation is as the following: First, for the large Yukawa coupling of the tau slepton, the mixing between tau sleptons can be very large. As a result, the lighter stau can not only be significantly lighter than the top quark and all scalar quarks, but also at the same time their couplings to Higgs bosons can be strongly enhanced. Therefore, the reaction $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0 \tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-$ can be more phase-space favored, and also it would be accessible to produce and measure them at the NLC. Second, it has received growing attention that CP -violating phases associated with the third generation trilinear soft term can induce CP violation in the Higgs and the third generation sfermion sectors through quantum corrections [16]. Such phases may allow baryogenesis and do not necessarily violate the stringent bound from the nonobservation of electric dipole moments (EDM) [17, 18]. In fact, some of these phases can be $\mathcal{O}(1)$, so as to provide non-SM sources

of CP violation required for dynamical generation of the baryon asymmetry of the universe [19]. Since these phases directly affect the couplings of Higgs bosons to third generation sfermions, moreover, these couplings play an important role in the phenomenology of the third generation sfermions and Higgs bosons at colliders, we will consider these effects of the CP -violating phases on the associated Higgs production with the stau*-stau pair. Last, for most of the SUSY parameter space allowed by present data constrains, the MSSM Higgs sector is in the decoupling regime [20]. In this scenario, only the lightest Higgs boson would be accessible at the NLC, final states with the other Higgs bosons or with $\tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_2^-$ pair should be phase-space suppressed. In what follows, therefore, we will focus on the case of the lightest h^0 boson of MSSM in the decoupling regime, and discuss only the production in association with lighter tau sleptons.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II we outline the masses and mixing of the tau sleptons, and then we present the relevant couplings and analytical expressions of the production cross section for the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0 \tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-$. In Sec.III, a detailed numerical analysis of the cross section is given in an appropriate MSSM scenario satisfying the experimental and theoretical constraints. Sec.IV is devoted to the conclusions.

II. MASSES, COUPLINGS AND CROSS SECTION

In this section, first, to fix notation we will simply summarize the masses and mixing of the tau slepton sector in the MSSM, and then list the relevant couplings involved in the associated production of the lightest neutral Higgs boson with tau sleptons. Finally, we will give analytical results of the cross section of $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0 \tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-$ production.

A. Tau slepton mass and mixing

In the tau slepton sector [1, 2], the left- and right-handed tau sleptons can strongly mix, the mass-squared matrix is given by

$$M_{\tilde{\tau}}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M_L^2 & m_{\tau}(A_{\tau} + \mu \tan \beta) \\ m_{\tau}(A_{\tau}^* + \mu^* \tan \beta) & M_R^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} M_L^2 &= m_{\tilde{\tau}_L}^2 + m_{\tau}^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2}M_Z^2 - M_W^2\right) \cos 2\beta, \\ M_R^2 &= m_{\tilde{\tau}_R}^2 + m_{\tau}^2 + (M_Z^2 - M_W^2) \cos 2\beta, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $m_{\tilde{\tau}_{L,R}}$ are the left- and right-handed soft SUSY-breaking tau slepton

masses, respectively. The soft breaking trilinear stau coupling A_τ and Higgs mass mixing parameter μ are complex,

$$A_\tau = |A_\tau|e^{i\varphi}, \quad \mu = |\mu|e^{i\eta}. \quad (3)$$

The phases φ and η are the sources of CP violation. In fact, the phase η can be transferred into the phase φ in the form of $\varphi - \eta$ by the field redefinition. So we will take μ to be real, and vary φ from 0 to 2π in the following. The tau slepton mass eigenstates can be realized by a unitary transformation U which diagonalizes the mass-squared matrix M_τ^2 ,

$$U M_\tau^2 U^\dagger = \text{diag}(m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}^2, m_{\tilde{\tau}_2}^2), \quad (4)$$

where the diagonalization matrix can be parameterized as

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_\tau & \sin \theta_\tau e^{i\delta} \\ -\sin \theta_\tau e^{-i\delta} & \cos \theta_\tau \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

with

$$\delta = \arg(A_\tau + \mu \tan \beta). \quad (6)$$

The tau slepton mixing angle and mass eigenvalues are then given as

$$\begin{aligned} \tan 2\theta &= \frac{2m_\tau |A_\tau + \mu \tan \beta|}{M_L^2 - M_R^2}, \\ m_{\tilde{\tau}_{1,2}}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[M_L^2 + M_R^2 \mp \sqrt{(M_L^2 - M_R^2)^2 + 4m_\tau^2 |A_\tau + \mu \tan \beta|^2} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with convention $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$, $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}^2 \leq m_{\tilde{\tau}_2}^2$. For large values of $|A_\tau|$, $|\mu|$ and $\tan \beta$, the mixing in the tau slepton sector can be very strong. In the constrained MSSM or minimal supergravity (mSUGRA) scenario [1, 21], the soft SUSY breaking scalar fermion masses and gaugino masses are respectively unified as m_0 and $m_{1/2}$ at the grand unified theory (GUT) scale M_{GUT} . The left- and right-handed tau slepton masses at the weak scale $\mathcal{O}(M_Z)$ are then given in terms of the universal masses m_0 and $m_{1/2}$ through running renormalization group equations (RGE) as [22]

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\tilde{\tau}_L}^2 &\simeq m_0^2 + 0.52 m_{1/2}^2 - 0.27 M_Z^2 \cos 2\beta, \\ m_{\tilde{\tau}_R}^2 &\simeq m_0^2 + 0.15 m_{1/2}^2 - 0.23 M_Z^2 \cos 2\beta. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Inputting values of the parameters $|A_\tau|$, $|\mu|$, φ , $\tan \beta$, m_0 , $m_{1/2}$, the mass spectra and mixing angle of the tau sleptons can then be worked out. For smaller values of m_0 and $m_{1/2}$, the stau masses are lower.

FIG. 1. Feynman diagrams for $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$ production.

B. $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$ production

$e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$ production proceeds via three kinds of diagrams, as shown in Fig. 1. When the $h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^*\tilde{\tau}_1$ couplings are large, the most important is Higgs boson emission from the $\tilde{\tau}_1$ states which are produced through s-channel photon and Z-boson exchange (Diag. a and b in Fig. 1). One also has the conversion of $\tilde{\tau}_2$ to $\tilde{\tau}_1$, which involves the $h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^*\tilde{\tau}_2$ vertex (Diag. c and d in Fig. 1). The last type is h^0Z^* production with $Z^* \rightarrow \tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$ (Diag. e in Fig. 1). Though the two last types of Feynman diagrams turn out to give small contributions, there are some regions in the parameter space where they cannot be neglected. The relevant couplings for the process are described by the following set of interaction Lagrangian in the MSSM [1, 8]:

(a). The couplings of a neutral Higgs boson h^0 to a pair of tau sleptons $\tilde{\tau}_i\tilde{\tau}_j$ ($i, j = 1, 2$) is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{h^0\tilde{\tau}_i^*\tilde{\tau}_j} = g_{ij}h^0\tilde{\tau}_i^*\tilde{\tau}_j \quad (9)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{ij} = & \frac{gm_Z}{c_W} \left[\left(s_W^2 - \frac{1}{2} \right) \sin(\alpha + \beta) + \left(\frac{m_\tau}{m_Z} \right)^2 \frac{\sin \alpha}{\cos \beta} \right] (U_{1i}^\dagger)^* U_{1j}^\dagger \\
& + \frac{gm_Z}{c_W} \left[-s_W^2 \sin(\alpha + \beta) + \left(\frac{m_\tau}{m_Z} \right)^2 \frac{\sin \alpha}{\cos \beta} \right] (U_{2i}^\dagger)^* U_{2j}^\dagger \\
& + \frac{gm_\tau}{2c_W m_Z} \left[A_\tau^* \frac{\sin \alpha}{\cos \beta} - \mu^* \frac{\cos \alpha}{\cos \beta} \right] (U_{2i}^\dagger)^* U_{1j}^\dagger \\
& + \frac{gm_\tau}{2c_W m_Z} \left[A_\tau \frac{\sin \alpha}{\cos \beta} - \mu \frac{\cos \alpha}{\cos \beta} \right] (U_{1i}^\dagger)^* U_{2j}^\dagger, \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

where $s_W = \sin \theta_W$, $c_W = \cos \theta_W$, α is the CP -even Higgs mixing angle at the tree level. When the loop corrections are included, the tree level parameters are deformed, even inducing the mixing among Higgs with different CP properties [23]. In the decoupling limit and up to very small radiative corrections, however, the mixing angle α reaches the limit $\beta - \pi/2$.

(b). The couplings of neutral vector gauge bosons (γ and Z^0) to tau slepton pairs are written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{V\tilde{\tau}_i^* \tilde{\tau}_j} = \frac{ig}{c_W} \left[s_W c_W \delta_{ij} A^\mu + \left(-s_W^2 \delta_{ij} + \frac{1}{2} (U_{1i}^\dagger)^* U_{1j}^\dagger \right) Z^\mu \right] \tilde{\tau}_i^* \overleftrightarrow{\partial}_\mu \tilde{\tau}_j. \tag{11}$$

(c). The couplings of neutral vector gauge bosons to charged lepton pairs are described by the same one as in the SM

$$\mathcal{L}_{V\bar{f}f} = \frac{g}{c_W} \left\{ s_W c_W A^\mu \bar{f} \gamma_\mu f + Z^\mu \bar{f} \gamma_\mu \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - s_W^2 \right) \frac{1 - \gamma^5}{2} - s_W^2 \frac{1 + \gamma^5}{2} \right] f \right\}. \tag{12}$$

(d). The couplings of a neutral Higgs boson to a pair of massive neutral gauge bosons is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{h^0 ZZ} = \frac{gm_Z}{2c_W} \sin(\beta - \alpha) h^0 Z^\mu Z_\mu. \tag{13}$$

Using Feynman rules, the Dalitz plot density of the production cross section can be obtained. In terms of the energies E_1 , E_2 , E_h of the three final state particles $\tilde{\tau}_1^-$, $\tilde{\tau}_1^+$ and h^0 , respectively, it is written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\sigma}{dE_1 dE_2} = & \frac{m_e^2}{8(2\pi)^3 \sqrt{s^2 - 4sm_e^2}} \left\{ \frac{s}{8} |A|^2 + \frac{\sqrt{s} E_h}{4} \text{Re}(AB^*) \right. \\
& \left. + \left[\frac{m_h^2}{8} + \left(\frac{1}{8} - \frac{1}{2} s_W^2 + s_W^4 \right) (E_h^2 - m_h^2) \left(\frac{s}{3m_e^2} + \frac{2}{3} \right) \right] |B|^2 \right\}, \tag{14}
\end{aligned}$$

where as usual s is the total center-of-mass energy squared, the coefficients A and B are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A = & \left(\frac{g}{c_W m_Z} \right)^2 \left[g_{11} \left(\frac{|U_{11}^\dagger|^2}{2} - s_W^2 \right) \left(\frac{1}{s - 2\sqrt{s}E_1} + \frac{1}{s - 2\sqrt{s}E_2} \right) \right. \\
& + g_{12} \frac{(U_{12}^\dagger)^* U_{11}^\dagger}{2} \frac{1}{s - 2\sqrt{s}E_2 + m_1^2 - m_2^2} \\
& + g_{21} \frac{(U_{11}^\dagger)^* U_{12}^\dagger}{2} \frac{1}{s - 2\sqrt{s}E_1 + m_1^2 - m_2^2} \\
& \left. + i \left(\frac{|U_{11}^\dagger|^2}{2} - s_W^2 \right) \frac{g \sin(\beta - \alpha)(s - \sqrt{s}E_h - m_Z^2)}{c_W m_Z (s - m_Z^2)} \right], \\
B = & i \left(\frac{|U_{11}^\dagger|^2}{2} - s_W^2 \right) \frac{g^3 \sin(\beta - \alpha)}{c_W^3 m_Z (s - m_Z^2)}. \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

To obtain the total production cross section $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0 \tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-)$, one can rewrite equation (14) in the standard form for the Dalitz plot density [24], and then integrate over the variables s_{12} , s_{23} whose integration bounds are given from kinematics. For a given center of mass energy the cross section depends on the masses of created particles and vanishes at the kinematic boundary.

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

In this section, we will illustrate our numerical results of the total production cross section for $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0 \tilde{\tau}_1^+ \tilde{\tau}_1^-$ based on a specific constrained MSSM scenario for the relevant SUSY parameters. The whole parameters appearing in our analyses contain $|A_\tau|$, $|\mu|$, φ , $\tan\beta$, m_0 , $m_{1/2}$, m_h . Including the two-loop radiative corrections, the mass of the lightest Higgs boson, m_h , depends mainly on the following variables [25]: the top quark mass, the top and bottom squark masses, the mixing in the stop sector, the pseudoscalar Higgs mass m_A and $\tan\beta$. In particular scenarios, like in SUGRA or gauge and anomaly mediation [21, 26, 27], some of the soft parameters may be related to each other. However, since the mechanism of SUSY breaking is unknown, the soft SUSY breaking parameters associated with the tau slepton sector can be considered to be independent of the parameters in the Higgs and squark sector [28]. In what follows, therefore, we consider the former seven parameters as free phenomenological parameters to be constrained by experimental and theoretical considerations. Among the constraints that we are going to impose on the MSSM are those which follow from the comparison of

FIG. 2. The cross section $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-)$ as a function of the scalar fermion mass m_0 for $\tan\beta = 5$, $|\mu| = 500$ GeV, $|A_\tau| = 1$ TeV, $\varphi = \pi/4$, $m_h = 120$ GeV. Three curves correspond respectively to three representative values of the gaugino mass $m_{1/2}$.

the SM with experimental data, from the experimental limits on the masses of yet unobserved particles [24], etc, and also those that follow from the ideas of unification and from SUSY GUT models [29].

In the following numerical analysis, we fix the center of mass energy to $\sqrt{s} = 1$ TeV, and then demonstrate in turn the dependence of the cross section on the choice of parameters. In Fig. 2 and Fig. 3, the cross section is shown as a function of the unified scalar fermion mass m_0 for the case of low and high $\tan\beta$ value: $\tan\beta = 5$ and $\tan\beta = 40$, respectively. Three curves in each figure correspond respectively to three chosen representative values of the unified gaugino mass $m_{1/2}$. The other parameters are typically taken, for example, as the following: $|A_\tau| = 1$ TeV, $\varphi = \pi/4$, $m_h = 120$ GeV, $|\mu| = 500$ GeV (for $\tan\beta = 5$), $|\mu| = 300$ GeV (for $\tan\beta = 40$). As can be seen, a typical magnitude of the cross section is $0.002 \sim 0.03$ fb. The variation of magnitude depends mainly on m_0 . As the value of m_0 is increased, the cross section drops rather dramatically. The values of $m_{1/2}$ do not change the whole trends of the plots, but can slightly shift the value of the cross section in the same order of magnitude. This is due to the fact that the tau slepton masses basically depend on m_0 . In addition, the value of $\tan\beta$ can also influence the value of the cross section obviously, which can be seen from the position interchange of the solid line and the long-dashed line in the two graphs, in particular, for the large $\tan\beta$, smaller m_0 and $m_{1/2}$ are excluded by experimental limits. As the value of $\tan\beta$ increases from low to large, the cross section decreases significantly. However, for no more than about 200 GeV value of m_0 in the case of the low $\tan\beta$ (about 150 GeV

FIG. 3. The cross section $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-)$ as a function of the scalar fermion mass m_0 for $\tan\beta = 40$, $|\mu| = 300$ GeV, $|A_\tau| = 1$ TeV, $\varphi = \pi/4$, $m_h = 120$ GeV. Three curves correspond respectively to three representative values of the gaugino mass $m_{1/2}$.

in the case of the large $\tan\beta$), the production cross section can exceed the value $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-) \sim 0.01$ fb. With a integrated luminosity 500 fb^{-1} , this provides several dozen events in a few years, which should be sufficient as a sample to isolate the final state and measure the $g_{h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-}$ coupling with some accuracy.

In the Fig. 4, the cross section is displayed as a function of the Higgs mass mixing parameter $|\mu|$ for three representative values of the lightest Higgs boson mass m_h , and the other parameters are fixed to $\tan\beta = 5$, $|A_\tau| = 1$ TeV, $\varphi = \pi/4$, $m_0 = 200$ GeV, $m_{1/2} = 250$ GeV. The value of $|\mu|$ is constrained by the requirement of radiative electroweak symmetry breaking [4], while the values of m_h are chosen from the current experimental and theoretical considerations [25, 30]. The plots show that the cross section changes somewhat large with values of $|\mu|$ but is not too sensitive to the values of m_h . For a larger value of $|\mu|$, the cross section is smaller. When the value of m_h is increased by 20 GeV, the cross section drops approximately 0.001 fb.

The CP violating phases in A_τ , $\arg(A_\tau)$, can modify the masses and the mixing parameters of stau as well as the Higgs-stau*-stau couplings. This would also have large impact on the production cross section of the $h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$ final state since it is directly proportional to the square of the $h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$ couplings. In Fig. 5, the cross section is shown as a function of the CP -violating phase φ ($=\arg(A_\tau)$) for three representative values of the soft breaking trilinear stau coupling $|A_\tau|$, and the other parameters are fixed to $\tan\beta = 5$, $|\mu| = 500$ GeV, $m_h = 120$ GeV, $m_0 = 200$ GeV, $m_{1/2} = 250$ GeV. The graph

FIG. 5. The cross section $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-)$ as a function of the CP -violating phase φ for $\tan\beta = 5$, $|\mu| = 500$ GeV, $m_h = 120$ GeV, $m_0 = 200$ GeV, $m_{1/2} = 250$ GeV. Three curves correspond respectively to three representative values of the soft breaking trilinear stau coupling $|A_\tau|$.

shows that the cross section has a symmetry about $\varphi = \pi$. This results from that the stau mass $m_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$ are symmetric under $\varphi \rightarrow \varphi - 2\pi$. Furthermore, the cross section reaches a maximum near $\varphi = \pi$. This is because the coupling $g_{h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^*\tilde{\tau}_1}$ has a maximum at $\varphi = \pi$ and its phase dependence is stronger than that of the masses of stau. However, the trends of plots and the varying magnitude of the cross section are obviously subject to the values of $|A_\tau|$, in particular, it should be noted that the cross section might increase or also decrease with the values of $|A_\tau|$ in deferent interval of the phase φ .

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, in the framework of the CP violating MSSM, we have discussed the production of the lightest neutral Higgs particle in association with the lighter tau slepton pair, $e^+e^- \rightarrow h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$, at future high-energy e^+e^- linear colliders. Simple analytical formulae for the cross section of the three-body process have been given. In a specific constrained MSSM scenario, where the lightest Higgs boson is in the decoupling regime, we have analyzed in detail the dependence of the cross section on the relevant SUSY parameters. On the one hand, for large values of $|A_\tau|$, $|\mu|$ and $\tan\beta$, the mixing between tau sleptons can be very large, this results in the lighter stau can not only be rather light but also at the same time their couplings to Higgs bosons can be strongly enhanced. As a result, the cross section can be very substantial. On the other hand, the effect of the CP violating phase in A_τ on the cross section is also demonstrated. It can induce a sizable change of the cross section through the significant dependence of the stau masses and maxing as well as the $h^0\tilde{\tau}_1^+\tilde{\tau}_1^-$ couplings on the phase. At e^+e^- colliders with c.m.energy around $\sqrt{s} = 1$ TeV and with very high luminosity $\int \mathcal{L}dt \sim 500$ fb $^{-1}$, the typical cross section is of the order of $\mathcal{O}(0.002 \sim 0.03)$ fb depending mainly on the universal scalar fermion mass m_0 , in particular for light m_0 ($m_0 \lesssim 150$ GeV), the cross section can exceed the level of a 0.01 fb, leading to several dozen events in a few years. In the case where the tau slepton decays into a neutrino and a chargino, the final state topology should be easy to be seen experimentally owing to the clean environment of these colliders. Therefore, all of these results can be expected to be detectable at future e^+e^- linear colliders. Analyzing these final states will allow to measure this important coupling and determine the value of the CP violating phase, thus opening a window to probe directly some of the soft-SUSY breaking scalar potential and also to shed some light on the SUSY breaking mechanism.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

One of the authors, W. M. Yang, thanks A. Djouadi for useful comments very much, and thanks M. Z. Yang for helpful discussions. This work is in part supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China.

References

- [1] H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. 110, 1 (1984); H. Haber and G. Kane, *ibid.* 117, 75 (1985).
- [2] M. Drees, hep-ph/9611409; S. P. Martin, hep-ph/9709356; M. Peskin, hep-ph/9705479; D. I. Kazakov, hep-ph/0012288.
- [3] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B188, 513 (1981).
- [4] L. Ibanez and G. G. Ross, Phys. Lett. B 110, 215 (1982); L. Alvarez-Gaume, M. Claudsen, and M. Wise, Nucl. Phys. B221, 495 (1983).
- [5] U. Amaldi, W. de Boer, and H. Fürstenau, Phys. Lett. B 260, 447 (1991); P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. D 44, 817 (1991); J. Ellis, S. Kelley, and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B 260, 131 (1991).
- [6] A. D. Sakharov, JETP Lett. 91B, 24 (1967); I. Affleck and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. B249, 361 (1985).
- [7] A. Bottino and N. Fornengo, hep-ph/9904469; J. D. Wells, Phys. Lett. B 443, 196 (1998); J. Ellis, T. Falk, G. Ganis, and K. A. Olive, Phys. Rev. D 62, 075010 (2000).
- [8] J. Gunion, H. E. Haber, G. Kane and S. Dawson, *The Higgs hunter's guide*, Addison-Wesley, New York, 1990; hep-ph/9302272, Erratum.
- [9] See, for instance, <http://hephiggs.web.cern.ch/LEPHIGGS/paper/index.html>; M. Carena *et al.*, hep-ph/0010338; D. Zeppenfeld, hep-ph/9902307.
- [10] R. D. Heuer, D. J. Miller, F. Richard, and P. Zerwas, hep-ph/0106315; ECFA/DESY LC Physics Working Group Collaboration, E. Accomando *et al.*, Phys. Rep. 299, 1 (1998).
- [11] J. Ellis, M. K. Gaillard, and D. V. Nanopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B106, 292 (1976); S. Heinemeyer, W. Hollik, J. Rosiek, and G. Weiglein, Eur. Phys. J. C 19, 535 (2001).
- [12] J. F. Gunion *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D 38, 3444 (1988); P. Chankowski, S. Polorski, and J. Rosiek, Nucl. Phys. B423, 437 (1994).
- [13] A. Djouadi, V. Driesen, and C. Junger, Phys. Rev. D 54, 759 (1996).

- [14] A. Djouadi, J. L. Kneur, and G. Moultaka, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1830 (1998); Nucl. Phys. B569, 53 (2000); S. Dawson and L. Reina, Phys. Rev. D 57, 5851 (1998); G. Bélanger, F. Boudjema, T. Kon, and V. Lafage, Eur. Phys. J. C 9, 511 (1999).
- [15] A. Datta, A. Djouadi, J. L. Kneur, Phys. Lett. B 509, 299 (2001).
- [16] A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Lett. B 435, 88 (1998); D. A. Demir, Phys. Rev. D 60, 055006 (1999); M. Carena, J. Ellis, A. Pilaftsis, and C. E. M. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B586, 92 (2000); S. Y. Choi, M. Drees, and J. S. Lee, Phys. Lett. B481, 57 (2000); W. M. Yang and D. S. Du, Phys. Rev. D 65, 115005 (2002).
- [17] M. Carena, J. M. Moreno, M. Quiros, M. Seco, and C. E. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B599, 158 (2001); M. Brhlik, G. J. Good, and G. L. Kane, Phys. Rev. D 63, 035002 (2001).
- [18] T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, Phys. Lett. B 418, 98 (1998); Y. Kizukuri and N. Oshimo, Phys. Rev. D 46, 3025 (1992).
- [19] T. Falk and K. V. Olive, Phys. Lett. B 439, 71 (1998); M. P. Worah, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 3810 (1997); N. Rius and V. Sanz, Nucl. Phys. B570, 1555 (2000).
- [20] H. Haber, in *Perspectives in Higgs Physics II*, ed. G. L. Kane, World Scientific, Singapore, 1998; M. Carena and H. E. Haber, hep-ph/0208209.
- [21] A. H. Chamseddine, R. Arnowitt, and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. 49, 970 (1982); R. Barbieri, S. Ferrara, and C. A. Savoy, Phys. Lett. B 119, 343 (1982); L. Hall, J. Lykken, and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D 27, 2359 (1983).
- [22] W. de Boer, R. Ehret and D. Kazakov, Z. Phys. C 67, 647 (1995); *ibid.* 71, 415 (1996).
- [23] A. Pilaftsis and C. E. Wagner, Nucl. Phys. B553, 3 (1999); A. G. Akeroyd and A. Arhrib, Phys. Rev. D 64, 095018 (2001).
- [24] D. E. Groom *et al.*, *Review of Particle Physics*, Eur. Phys. J. C 15, 1 (2000).
- [25] M. Carena, J. Ellis, A. Pilaftsis, and C. E. M. Wagner, hep-ph/0111245, and references therein.

- [26] M. Dine and A. E. Nelson, Phys. Rev. D 48, 1277 (1993); M. Dine and A. E. Nelson, Y. Nir and Y. Shirman, Phys. Rev. D53, 2658 (1996).
- [27] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Nucl. Phys. B557, 79 (1999); G. F. Giudice, M. A. Luty, H. Murayama and R. Rattazzi, JHEP, 9812, 027 (1998).
- [28] J. Ellis, K. A. Olive, Y. Santoso, Phys. Lett. B 539, 107 (2002).
- [29] R. N. Mohapatra, hep-ph/9911272, and references therein.
- [30] ALEPHY, DELPHI, L3 and OPAL Collaborations, P. Bock *et al.*, CERN-EP-2000-055; M. Carena *et al.*, *Report of the Tevatron Higgs working group*, hep-ph/0010338; D. Cavalli *et al.*, *The Higgs Working Group: Summary Report*, hep-ph/0203056.